



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/585,877      | 07/11/2006  | Dieter Urban         | 293249US0PCT        | 7723             |

22850 7590 08/21/2009  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SASTRI, SATYA B

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1796

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

08/21/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com



***Restriction Requirement***

1. Applicant's response to restriction requirement in the communication filed on 7/1/09 is acknowledged. Upon further consideration, claims are grouped differently than previously presented and therefore, a new restriction requirement is presented herein.

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-9, drawn to a dispersion or solution of a polymer having 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl group,

Group II, claims 10-13, drawn to a method of using the dispersion of a polymer having 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl group,

Group III, claims 14-16, drawn to a specific free radically polymerizable monomer having 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl group.

3. The inventions listed as Groups I, II and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reason: The technical feature that is common to Groups I to III is 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl group. This feature is taught by the prior art of Pacetti et al. (US 7,563,454 B1). Specifically, attention is drawn to working example 4 therein

Art Unit: 1796

that discloses an ethylenically unsaturated monomer containing 3,4-dihydroxyphenyl group and a polymer comprising the same. Since the common technical feature of claims belonging to Groups I to III fails to define a contribution over US 7,563,454 B1, the common technical feature does not amount to a special technical feature and hence there is lack of unity between the cited groups.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even if the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention and species.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence to identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly submit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one or more inventions/species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) of the other invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 1796

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of new restriction requirement presented herein.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATYA B. SASTRI whose telephone number is (571)272-1112. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Thur, Fri. 7am-5.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272 1112. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Satya B Sastri/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796